

Appn No. 09/607,852  
Amtd. Dated October 8, 2003  
Reply to Office action of July 8, 2003

14

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. The Examiner has objected to the Information Disclosure Statement on the grounds that copies of the following US patents were not provided along with the IDS:

US 5,051,736, US 5,477,012, US 5,652,412, US 5,661,506; and US 5,852,434.

In reply, the Applicant provides copies of these documents with the confirmation copy of this fax.

2. The Examiner has raised novelty objections to claims 1-11, 15-20, 22-24, 26-36, 38-43 and 46 on the basis of Dymetman (US 6,330,976). In reply, the Applicant makes the following submissions:

(a) The Applicant notes that in the Dymetman system, the document received by the recipient is merely a fax which has no coded data on it. As the Examiner states:

*"It is also interpreted that the recipient receives an image of the NotePaper (see column 22, lines 20-23), which thus includes the Send icon representative of the parameter."*

In the Dymetman arrangement, the recipient of the fax is not able to interact with the fax, and thus participate in a conference with the other party. In order to make it clearer that there is another conferencing form with which the "other conference participant" may interact, the Applicant has sought to amend method claim 1 to show that the method is performed via:

*"at least one recipient conferencing form remote from said at least one conferencing form and containing information representative of at least one parameter relating to the conferencing session and including recipient coded data indicative of the identity of the recipient conferencing form and of at least one reference point of the recipient conferencing form."*

This amendment makes clear that the recipient of the "recipient conferencing form" is able to interact with the form (via its recipient coded data and a coded-data-reading sensing device). In this way, the recipient is able to participate in the conference.

(b) The Applicant also notes that in the Dymetman system, the coded pages are pre-printed by specialist "coded substrate suppliers" which then have additional information printed on them by "publishers." (See col. 11, lines 13 to 15 "the production of coded substrate[s] will be a process carried out by specialized machines" and col. 11, lines 63 to 65 "A publisher can buy these apparently uniformly white sheets and can print visible markings on them using standard ink.") Any interaction in the Dymetman arrangement is one-way. That is, users might send some information using the coded substrate, but the recipient does not receive a coded substrate with the user's message on it, so they can't reply to the message in the same manner. In addition, when a user requests a document, the document is not provided in the form of a further coded substrate, but is provided on a computer screen. This pre-printing limitation of the Dymetman system precludes the possibility of two users interacting using coded data substrates that are generated on the fly, in response to each others input.

Appn No. 09/607,852  
Amdt. Dated October 8, 2003  
Reply to Office action of July 8, 2003

15

Accordingly, the Dymetman arrangement teaches away from the conference application claimed by the Applicant.

3. Since neither Dymetman nor the other citations disclose all of the claimed features of amended claim 1, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is novel in light of the citations. Similar comments apply in relation to other independent claims 4, 27 and 30 which have been amended in a corresponding manner. Since these independent claims are novel and inventive, the Applicant submits that the dependent claims, which add additional novel and inventive features, are similarly acceptable. The Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the novelty and inventive objections raised.

4. A number of other minor amendments have been made to the claims. Those amendments have been made in order to improve the clarity of the claims and not for the purpose of avoiding the prior art.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



---

PAUL LAPSTUN



---

KIA SILVERBROOK



---

JACQUELINE ANNE LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762